

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
10

11 RANDY V. MAESTAS,

12 Plaintiff,

13 v.

14 SACRAMENTO COUNTY JAIL,

15 Defendants.  
16

No. 2:21-cv-00665-TLN-JDP

**ORDER**

17 Plaintiff, proceeding *pro se*, has filed this civil rights action seeking relief under 42 U.S.C.  
18 § 1983. The matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §  
19 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302.

20 On August 9, 2022, the magistrate judge filed findings and recommendations herein  
21 which were served on Plaintiff and which contained notice to Plaintiff that any objections to the  
22 findings and recommendations were to be filed within fourteen days. (ECF No. 25.) Plaintiff has  
23 not filed objections to the findings and recommendations.

24 The Court presumes that any findings of fact are correct. *See Orand v. United States*, 602  
25 F.2d 207, 208 (9th Cir. 1979). The magistrate judge's conclusions of law are reviewed de novo.  
26 *See Robbins v. Carey*, 481 F.3d 1143, 1147 (9th Cir. 2007) (“[D]eterminations of law by the  
27 magistrate judge are reviewed de novo by both the district court and [the appellate] court . . .”).

28 //

1 Having reviewed the file, the Court finds the findings and recommendations to be  
2 supported by the record and by the proper analysis.


3 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

4 1. The Findings and Recommendations filed August 9, 2022 (ECF No. 25), are  
5 ADOPTED in full;

6 2. Plaintiff's Second Amended Complaint (ECF No. 24) is DISMISSED without leave to  
7 amend; and

8 3. The Clerk of Court is directed to close this case.

9 **DATED: September 21, 2022**

10   
11 \_\_\_\_\_  
12 Troy L. Nunley  
13 United States District Judge  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28